

2-22-2010

## Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Monday, February 22, 2010

Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee

Follow this and additional works at: [http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_aa](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa)

---

### Recommended Citation

Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee, "Minutes, Arts & Sciences Academic Affairs Committee Meeting, Monday, February 22, 2010" (2010). *Academic Affairs Committee Minutes*. Paper 76.  
[http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as\\_aa/76](http://scholarship.rollins.edu/as_aa/76)

This Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Arts and Sciences Minutes at Rollins Scholarship Online. It has been accepted for inclusion in Academic Affairs Committee Minutes by an authorized administrator of Rollins Scholarship Online. For more information, please contact [wzhang@rollins.edu](mailto:wzhang@rollins.edu).

AAC Minutes – February 22, 2010

In attendance: Jim Small (Chair), Barry Levis, Laurie Joyner, Tocarra Mallard, Sebastian Novak, Dawn Roe, Don Rogers, Steven St. John (Secretary), Lito Valdivia

Guests in attendance: Allisa Johnson

The meeting was called to order at 7:38 a.m.

**Minutes.** The minutes of February 15 were approved pending two clarifications (one on London Summer Program revenue and one on Department Chair approval of internship credit).

**Old Business.**

Internship Clarification

Allisa Johnson introduced proposed changes to the catalogue text defining the Credit/No Credit policy and the Internship policy (as charged last week by AAC). The changes introduced to the document resolve a potential conflict between these policies. A statement clarified that “Courses normally offered for a letter grade, in which the student has elected to change to a CR/NC grade” are the courses restricted from counting toward Gen Ed, major, minor, or concentration requirements. A paragraph added to the Credit/No Credit policy statement deals directly with the special case of academic internships, as these courses are de facto CR/NC courses (i.e., not “normally offered for a letter grade”). The paragraph provides explicit direction to departments and advisors (based on policies approved by AAC in 2007) in the use of Academic Internships in counting toward major, minor, or concentration requirements. This advice codifies the current practice of departments deciding what is best for their majors in terms of use of internships. The Academic Internship policy was reorganized as recommended by AAC around subheadings (“Eligibility Criteria”, “Registration”, “Course Requirements”, “Interdisciplinary, Major, or Minor Credit”). In addition to this structural change and minor clarifications, a paragraph was added mirroring the paragraph added to the Credit/No Credit policy explicating the procedures required to have an internship (with departmental approval) satisfy major, minor, or program requirements.

Don raised the concern about the sentence “Course normally graded as CR/NC (internships, information technology,...)” interpreting that it might prevent students from counting CR/NC courses toward minimum term requirements. He raised the issue of the Bright Futures Scholarship changes, which he thought had necessitated a bending of this rule in certain cases to permit students to maintain enough credits to keep the scholarship. Laurie felt that this was a very rare case, and didn’t recommend making policy changes to account for exceptional cases.

Sebastian asked if the sentence “Students who wish to take a course on a credit/no credit basis... must inform the Office of Student Records, no later than two weeks, ten (10) class days, after the beginning of the [term]” represented a policy change. Laurie replied that this was not, that he was thinking of a separate policy that permitted a late CR/NC option up until the last day of class on one occasion in the student’s career. This policy is explicated in the next section of the catalogue (and is unmodified).

The question was raised about whether all international academic internships are handled by the Office of Academic Internships or if some were handled by International Programs. Laurie and Allisa clarified that currently some internships are under the purview of International Programs. Both Laurie and Allisa agreed that as International Programs has expanded, more internships are coming outside the normal mechanisms of academic oversight and that this might not be ideal. Don noted that at one time there was strong faculty oversight of these internships (with faculty visiting on site overseas internships). Barry noted that in the History department, students returning from an International internship made a presentation to a member of the History faculty. Allisa asked if the committee felt that these internships should be a joint responsibility of her office and International Programs and AAC agreed.

Don wondered if these changes represented policy changes that required a faculty colloquium or other means of faculty input. Barry felt that these changes were not policy changes but procedural clarifications. This latter sentiment was generally shared.

Barry asked about whether students could transfer in Academic Internship credit and Allisa responded “no.”

Jim asked for a motion. Dawn moved that AAC accept the document (Credit/No Credit and Internship revisions) with two revisions: an organizational change to communicate that students should first consult with their academic advisor, and a change indicating that all internships fall under the Director of Academic Internships (in collaboration with International Programs as appropriate). The motion carried unanimously.

#### Hoyt Edge Clarification Request

By email, Hoyt Edge, on behalf of the Department of Philosophy and Religion, asked AAC why the question appeared on the New Course Proposal Form “How many electives does your department offer per year?” Hoyt noted that “elective” was a vague word. Jim asked if the New Course Subcommittee had addressed the question.

Steve answered that it had been discussed. The question had been on the form for many years, and allowed the New Course Subcommittee to assess whether or not a department was offering a schedule that permitted students to get courses they needed and whether a department might be offering too many electives that threatened strong enrollments. Steve and Barry noted that it was not a response that they spent much time on when evaluating courses, and Steve suggested that this response was most useful for the Registrar, an ex-officio member of the New Course Subcommittee, who had the most knowledge about scheduling and

enrollment issues. Laurie asked what Toni Holbrook had said about the Hoyt Edge request, but Steve was unable to report definitively. He felt that, in general, Toni considered it a valuable part of the form. He could not recall if Toni had offered to draft a response to Hoyt's question. Laurie offered to ask Toni her views on the request.

Chris noted that it was easy to have different interpretations of the question. Laurie said that she could understand how the question might be useful in providing data to the committee and the registrar on scheduling patterns, and offered International Business as an example of a department that has successfully balanced its schedule and requirements to serve a large number of students with a relatively small number of faculty.

Jim suggested the matter be referred back to the subcommittee.

#### Blended Learning

Don presented the report of the ad-hoc committee to examine Blended Learning (Don, Chris, Annie). He reported that the committee had interviewed several faculty members, some students, and peer institutions (a "convenience sample" of contacts at peer schools). The committee deliberated based on this information and made six recommendations to AAC. In brief, these recommendations were to: 1) Not discourage innovative approach to teaching, 2) encourage IT to develop informational workshops on Blended Learning, 3) ask IT to develop an initial set of guidelines that would then be open to faculty input, 4) use these guidelines when evaluating courses employing Blended Learning approaches, 5) Not re-review approved courses now being taught with Blended Learning approaches, and 6) Delay funding courses from the Request for Proposals until after development of such guidelines.

Don noted that he felt that Holt's success in maintaining its enrollments had decreased the urgency (from Jim Eck's perspective) in developing Blended courses in Holt.

Laurie noted that Jim Zimmerman, who has an academic (non-Information Technology) background, has been hired to the Teaching & Learning Center and will be on campus in July and might be a good resource for these issues.

Several committee members expressed concern that guidelines should be led by faculty, not by IT. Don noted that Sue Easton had developed guidelines that the ad-hoc committee found very useful.

AAC asked Don's ad-hoc group to make explicit guidelines (i.e., relevant to Recommendation #3) and bring those back to committee.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:39 a.m.